Egemen Çağrı MIZRAK

Dr, Namık Kemal Üniversitesi/Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi/Tarih Bölümü/Ortaçağ Tarihi Anabilim Dalı, Tekirdağ/Türkiye
Dr, Namık Kemal University/Faculty of Arts and Sciences/Department of History/Department of Medieval History, Tekirdağ/Turkey
eposta: ecmizrak@nku.edu.tr
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9876-9971 - RorID: https://ror.org/01a0mk874

Atıf/Citation: Mızrak, Egemen Çağrı. 2023. The Judaic Codes of The Khazar Qaganate's Sacred-Diarchy. *Avrasya Uluslararası Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 11(34), 325-336.
https://doi.org/10.33692/avrasyad.1219956

Makale Bilgisi / Article Information

Makale Türü /Article Types:	Araştırma Makalesi/Dissertation Summary
Geliş Tarihi /Received:	16.12.2022
Kabul Tarihi/Accepted:	06.03.2023
Yayın Tarihi/Published:	20.03.2023

THE JUDAIC CODES OF THE KHAZAR QAGANATE'S SACRED-DIARCHY

ABSTRACT

The Khazar Qaganate was one of the most prominent Turkic state in history with its military and economic power as well as its strong structure on institutional and judicial fields. For more than three hundred years of political existence in a geostrategic location over Northern Black Sea zone, Southern Russia, Caucasia and the shores of Caspian Sea, the Qaganate played a kind of buffer-state role for a long time between Byzantium Empire, Islamic Caliphate and Eurasian mounted-warriors. During this period, the adoption of new "universal" religions by the Inner Asian steppe nomads was also a common situation, however in a timeline, when the power of Islam was spreading rapidly and the Muslim–Christian conflict had started to flourish intensely, the conversion of Khazar royal elites to Judaism (8th-9th c. AD) made their history much more remarkable. Here, we don't intend to examine the questions on why/how/when did the Khazars embrace the Judaism. My goal is to illuminate the issues about the origins and functions of their ruling system called "Dual Kingship/Royal Diarchy or Sacral Kingship" by researchers (i define this administrative system as Sacred Diarchy), which is one of the most striking feature of the political structure of the Khazar Judaism. Although this diarchy model doesn't match with the functional structure of the Qaganal office observed in the old Turkic steppe state formations which scholars have generally related to the "äb/eb Qagan and/or Yabgu Qagan" models–in particular the Gök Türk administrative structure–, it has been interpreted as a traditional but also a unique system. In this article, by the way on the clues obtained from written sources it has been hypothesized that this unique model of the Khazar's "Sacred Diarchy" was probably a TaNaKh-based Judaic form, inheriting only some symbolic essences from old Altaic-Turkic origin steppe-state motifs.

Keywords: Khazar (s), Khazar Qaganate, Dual Kingship, Sacred Diarchy, Judaism.

Avrasyad e-ISSN: 2147-2610

HAZAR KAĞANLIĞININ KUTSAL-İKİLİ YÖNETİMİNİN JUDAİK ŞİFRELERİ

ÖZ

Askeri ve iktisadi gücü, kurumsal ve hukuksal alanlardaki sağlam yapısıyla, Hazar Kağanlığı,tarihteki en göze çarpan Türk devletlerinden biri olmuştur. Üç yüz yılı aşkın siyasi varlığı; Karadeniz'in Kuzey kuşağı, Güney Rusya, Kafkasya ve Hazar Denizi kıyıları üzerindeki jeo-stratejik konumu itibariyle Kağanlık, Bizans İmparatorluğu, İslam Halifeliği ve atlı-savaşçı Avrasya göçebeleri arasında uzun müddet bir nevi tambon devlet rolü oynamak durumunda kalmıştır. Söz konusu zaman diliminde, İç Asya kökenli bozkır göçebelerinin, "evrensel" dinleri benimsemesi meselesi sıradan bir durum olmakla beraber, İslam dininin hızla yayıldığı ve "Müslüman–Hristiyan" çatışmasının tohumlarının yoğun bir şekilde yeşerdiği bir dönemde, Hazar elitlerinin Yahudiğili benimsemesi (MS. 8.-9. yy.) onların tarihini daha da dikkat çekici bir hale getirmektedir. Bu makalede, Hazarlar'ın neden/nasıl/ne zaman Yahudiliği benimsediği sorularına cevap aramıyoruz, Amacım, Hazar siyasi yapısının en çarpıcı hususiyetlerinden biri olan ve araştırmacılar tarafından "İkili Krallık/İkili Yönetim ya da Kutsal Hükümranlık" adı verilen bu yönetim sisteminin (Kutsal-İkili Yönetim olarak tanımlamaktayım), kökenleri ve fonksiyonlarıyla ilgili meseleleri açıklığa kavuşturmaya çalışmak ya da en azından bu hususta araştırmacıların dikkatinden kaçan bazı önemli şifrelerin çözümüne yardımcı olmaktır. Eski Türk bozkır geleneğindeki Kağanlık müessesesinde rastlamadığımız bu hususi yapı, bilim çevrelerince bilhassa Gök Türkler'deki "äb/eb (ev) Kağan ve/veya Yabgu Kağan" modeliyle benzeştirilmiş; buna rağmen söz konusu İkili Krallık idare anlayışı geleneksel ve aynı zamanda nevi şahsına münhasır bir model olarak yorumlanmıştır. Bu çalışmada, yazılı kaynaklardaki ipuçlarından yola çıkılarak Hazarlar'ın bu benzersiz "Kutsal İkili-Yönetim" modeli, kadim Altay-Türk bozkır devlet motiflerinden yanlızca sembolik bazı öğeler barındıran, muhtemelen TaNaKh temelli bir yönetim formu olduğu hipotize edilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hazar(lar), Hazar Kağanlığı, İkili Hükümranlık, Kutsal-İkili Yönetim, Yahudilik.

Introduction

The Khazar Qaganate was a Turkic-origin state that played an active role in the North of the Black Sea region, Eastern Europe, Southern Russia, Caucasus and the Middle East between the 7th–10th Centuries AD. The Qaganate controlled substantial trade routes passing through the basins of the Don and İtil (Volga) rivers, along the shores of the Azov Sea, and across the terriotories between the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea and the Aral Lake. Thus, it had a vital geographic location in Eurasia's political and commercial community. As a heir to the Western Turk Qaganate, their political history was directly related to the Islamic Caliphate, the Byzantian Empire and later on the Kievan Rus'; and their genealogical structure intertwined with the various Turkic tribes, as well as Eastern Slavic, Caucassian, Finno-Ugric and Jewish peoples. With the collapse of the Western Turk Qaganate, *I-p'i-she-kuei*? who was thought to be a noble from the Ashina dynasty (the royal urug/clan of Turks) had become the head of the "Khazarian Wolves" in 650's AD and then the process of "Qaganate form" was flourished. Then the state showed a rapid rise with the defeat of the Great Bulgarian Qaganate

and the subjugation of Eastern Slavic tribes. In the 8th century, while the Qaganate was growing with its powerful armies, it also served as a barrier against Byzantium on the Crimean-Northern Black Sea line and Ummayyads in the Southern Caucasus. Although they had suffered from heavy defeats against The Caliphate – mostly from governor Marwān ibn Muhāmmad in 737 AD – they played a crucial role by preventing the entry of the fastest and most effective Jihadi movement in history through to Eastern Europe and Russia. However, in the 9th century after the Kabar revolt, which is thought to have developed in connection with strong spread of Judaism into the ruling-elites, the traditional syncretic Steppe state model based on the status of strong aristocratic war-lords (begs/beys) affiliated to the "Holy Qagans" from the Ashina urug, had gone to a change. And the structure of the state evolved into a "tax based commercial form", where the Muslim mercaneries (*Arsi/Arissi/Larissi*) from Khwârazm were providing the security. Under these circumstances, the state had weakened over time and lost its military deterrent. And finally, the Qaganate collapsed in the second half of the 10th century, unable to resist on to the rising power of the Kievan Rus'.

Their conversion to Judaism was most probably the main factor that made the Khazar Qaganate so remarkable in history – the conversion date has been disputed, but likely took place in the midst–second half of the 8th or the 9th. century AD. Al-Mas'udi's (ca 943) indication about the conversion of Khazar Qagan in the time of Abbasid Caliph Hârûn ar-Rašid (786-809 AD) has generally been taken for reliable. Even though it is not a discussion of this study, i'll briefly mention of other written sources related to the date of "the conversion", that the most researchers studying on this subject are aware of. According to Jehudah ha-Levi's (12th. c.) *Kuzari (Kitab al-Khazari)*, the conversion of Khazar Qagan took place after the debate on the merits of Islam, Christianity and Judaism in ca. 740 (400 years before his time ie. 1140). Andalusian al-Bekri (11th. c.) had also mentioned this debate before Ha-levi about the conversion of the Qagan. There was also another certain record about the religious debate and the conversion of Khazar Qagan coming from Byzantine sources. In the *Life of Constantine* – which was written shortly after the Saint's death (in 869) or in case before 882 – Constantin-Crill's (and his brother Methodius) Khazar mission was dated in ca. 860 or 861. In West, the earliest mention of the Khazars' conversion to Judaism was coming from a Frankish Benedictine monk, Druthmar of Aquitaine. The reference occurs in his commentary on Gospel of Matthew (24:14), written in 864 AD. More detailed and complicated "conversion date" was coming from the correspondences between Khazar King (i.e. Qagan) Joseph and Hasdai ibn Shaprut the Jewish courtier of Caliph Abd ar-Rahman III of Andalusia – in these letters (known as Genizah Letter and The Reply of Khazar King Joseph - The reply have also three versions) the conversion had taken place in two stages: periods of Bulan/Bolan (King Sabriel ? – the time 730-740's, as like 740's of *Kuzari*) and *Ovadiah/Obadiah* who established the religious law according to Halakha (he symbolized of much more Orthodoxy form ie. "Jewish Rabbinic" and this conversion date seems similar to al-Mas'udi's indication on the time of Hârûn ar-

COPE COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION ETHICS OPEN ACCESS CC BY NC
Avrasyad e-ISSN: 2147-2610

Rašid) (For detailed and comparative inquiry on old written sources about the conversion date of the Khazar Qagan see Zuckerman 1995: 241-253; Golden, 2007a: 158-159; Pritsak 1978: 271, 277-278; Dunlop 1954: 89-91).

Eventually, this powerful non-Hebrew origin state adopting to the Jewish faith was really a shocking event for Medieval world which was a process of Muslim-Christian conflict in literal sense and the pagan tribes had identified themselves among these two. The written sources about the conversion in Khazar Qaganate have generally come from the Islamic sources (9th-11th centuries), and there is also limited information transferred from Western sources.

1. The References in Ibn Faḍlân's Account

The accounts of Ibn Rustah (913's AD.) and Ibn Faḍlân (920's AD.) formed the leading arguments of my hypotheses; at first we will consider on the record of Âhmad Ibn Faḍlân, who received his information on Khazars from İtil Bulgars, enlighted us on division of power in the Qaganate and providing crucial clues about the Sacral Kingship. Ibn Faḍlân wrote that:

> "As concerns the king (*melik*) of Khazars, who is called Xâqân, *he does not show himself except (once) every four months, appearing at a great distance (mutenezzih)*. They call him *Great Xâqân* [خاقان الكبير]= [*Hakan el-Kebir*] and his deputy (*wekil*) is called *Xâqân Beh* [بَهْ خاقان]. It is the latter who leads his armies and governs them and takes charge of the affairs of the state and cares for the state and appears before the people and the neighboring kings show submission to him. *Every day He enters into the presence of the Great Xāqān; humbly (mutavâḍi'an), showing humility (iḫbât) and calmness (sakîna). He only enters before him barefoot and in his hand is a piece of firewood (ḥaṭab). When he greets him, he ignites this piece of firewood between his hands and when it is all burned up, he sits together with the king on his throne, on his right side* . His place is taken by a man called *K. nd. r* Xâqân and his turn by one called *Jâwšiğir*... When the sovereign king rides on horseback in public, the whole army marches out to escort him in procession, *but an interval of a mile is left between him and these cavalry*. Nor does any of his subjects see him without falling on his face and humbly doing him reverence, and not raising his head until the king has passed by. *The length of their rule is forty years*. If the king exceeds it by a single day, the subjects and his courtiers kill him. They say '*his mind has become diminished and his understanding become confused* '… But if the officers or the viceroy [Xāqān Beh] run away, the king [Great Xâqân] sends for them with their wives and children on others, together with their beasts of burden, furniture, weapons and houses. It sometimes happens that he cuts them through the middle and hangs up the severed parts; sometimes he hangs them by the neck from the trees. Occasionally, when he is favorurably disposed to them, he makes them his ostlers" (Frazer 1917: 388-390; Golden 1980: 98-99; Golden 2007b: 167-168; Şeşen 2010: 130-131).

COPE COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION ETHICS OPEN ACCESS CC BY NC
Avrasyad e-ISSN: 2147-2610

The prominent information given in Faḍlân's account: 1) Daily ceremony between the *Beg/Beh* (Ibn Rustah's *Îšâ*) and Qagan i.e. "Beg's entering into Qagan's presence barefoot, then igniting the firewood in his hand after saluted the Qagan"; 2) "The length of the Qagan's rule being up to 40 years" – if this limited/fixed period exceeded by a single day the courtiers and subjects put him to death. 3) "Keeping distance from the Qagan". The real power belongs to Beg/Beh; state, military and public affairs was governing by him. But the Qagan was like an "outsider" or "sacral" figure.

1.1. The Daily Salutation Ceremony Between the Qagan and the Beg (*Îšâ*)

Now, we start on the Ibn Faḍlân's record about the daily ceremonial rituel between Qagan and Beg/Beh – *Beg's entering into Qagan's presence barefoot and ignites the firewood in his hand after the salutation (this also means ask for permission to ignite) to the Qagan* – which concerns strongly Judaic religious practices and symbols; and even more a theatrical animation of the meeting between Moses and *YHWH* (God) at the burning bush, told in ***TaNaKh*** [Shemot (Exodus) III:2-6] and more detailed version in ***Al-Quran Al-Karim*** [Surah Tâhâ (20: 9-14)].

[Shemot (Exodus) III:2-6]:

> "An angel of the Lord (HaShem) appeared to him in a flame of fire from within the thorn bush, and behold, the thorn bush was burning with fire, but the thorn was not being consumed. So Moses said, 'Let me turn now and see this great spectacle why does it not burn up?'. The Lord saw that he had turned to see, and God called to him from within the thorn bush, and He said, 'Moses, Moses!' And he said 'Here I am!'. And He said 'Do not draw near here. Take your shoes off your feet, because the place upon which you stand is holy soil'. And He said, 'I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'. And Moses hid his face because he was afraid to look toward God". (JPS Tanakh 2003: 116)

As we mentioned above such a detailed version of this event was also cited in Quran;

[Surah Tâhâ (20: 9-14)]:

> "Was the story of Moses reached thee? Behold he saw a fire: So he said to his family, 'Tarry ye; I perceive a fire, perhaps i can bring you some burning brand [aizle] therefrom or find some guidance at the fire'. But when he came close to the fire, he was called 'O Moses! Verily i am thy Lord! Therefore put off your shoes: thou art in the sacred valley Tuva. I have chosen thee: Listen, then to the inspiration. 'Verily, i am Allah: There is no God but I: So serve thou Me (only), and establish regular prayer for My remembrance'". (The Holy Qur-Ān H.1411: 880-881)

So, Moses saw the fire in the burning bush and wanted to bring some aizle or fire for his family – and we can assume that he might have carried a firewood with him. Then, when he came close to the fire God called him and said that "take off your shoes/sandals" and be barefooted. This warning of God was due to the sanctity of the entered place; that is to say "you appear before God's presence". Here, "burning bush" was God himself and symbolises "the messenger/precursor and guidance of God" and "firewood" should be an instrument/intermediary used to receive the guidance of God shrouded in "fire" – after God's permission was granted. The "burning bush" has also been interpreted as a symbol of Israel (The Oxford Dictionary of Jewish Religion 1997: 143). And "Fire" is a crucial metaphor in TaNaKh. That's not only the theophanies of God were sometimes accompanied by fire but also it has got metaphorically in many meanings: **1.** *God's (YHWH/*Yahweh*) glory* **2.** *Holiness and Uniqueness* **3.** *The symbol of the God's Anger and Wrath* **4.** *Divine judgment, justice and destruction*. The related passages in **TaNaKh**: **Torah**-Shemot (Exodus) **[**III:2-6; IX:23-24; XIII:21-22; XIX: 18; XXIV:17]; Tor. Devarim (Deuteronomy) [IV:11, 24]; Tor. Vayikra (Leviticus) [IX:23-24; X:2]; Tor. Bamidbar (Numbers) [XI:1–XVI:35– XXVI:10]; **Ketuvim**-Iyov (Job) [I: 16]; Ket. Tehillim (Psalms) [XVIII: 13-14]; **Nevi'im**-Yeshayahu (Isaiah) [LXVI: 15-16]. (The New Bible Dictionary 1962: 422-423; Easton 2022: 435-436; Smith, 2011: 498). As understand in the relevant passages above, the ceremonial performance of role-playing on Qagan's Court, as it turns out, the plot is as follows; the Qagan was in God's role (God in the Burning Bush), while the Beg (*Îšâ*) was Moses. Beg was entering to the sacred place – i.e. Qagan's Court or "God's" presence – barefoot and a firewood in his hand; Beg's aim was receiving the "fire" i.e. the guidance of the God from the Qagan. And after the mutual salutation – that means of the Granted Permission of God – the firewood was ignited by the Beg (*Îšâ*).

As briefly, these arguments and vague metaphors-rituals in "Salutation Ceremony on Qagan's Court", are finding their explanatory answers exactly in that relevant passages of TaNaKh (Hebrew Bible–Christian Old Testament) and Al-Quran Al-Karim. Thus, these all datas and consequences are the certain signs of Judaic religious consept.

1.2. Forty Years Term Limit For Khazar Qagans'

"Forty years" term limit for the Khazar Qagans' – until now such a "numerical limitation" practice has not been known in the old Turkic state structures originating from the steppe tradition – that contains another symbolic metaphor, was likely taken its source from TaNaKh. In [Bamidbar (Numbers) XXXII: 13)], "40 years" is used to mean "a generation" about the events of God's punishment by his enforcer prophet Moses against Israelits who were afraid to make war on Canaan – "*The LORD's anger burned against Israel and he made them wander in wilderness forty years until the whole generation of those had done evil in his sight was gone*" (JPS Tanakh 2003: 360). Besides, according to the *Midrash* [Sefer HaYasar's Book of Exodus (31)], Moses became the king of the Cush (Ethiopia) after marriage with queen Adonya, and he was

reigned over Cush for 40 years (Ha-Yashar 1876). We have also seen that some early Hebrew kings' reigning periods were announced as forty years – Eli [Shmuel-I (I-Samuel) IV: 18)]; David [Shmuel-II (II-Samuel) V: 4] and Solomon [Melachim-I (I-Kings) XI: 42)] (JPS Tanakh 2003: 580, 653, 741) and in New Testament (Gospel) king Saul [Acts XIII: 21] (The Holy Bible 1952: 149).

As another important argument in this context, we can refer to the ruling periods of "Judges". The Book of Judges covers the time period from the death of Joshua to the rise of the prophet Samuel. The period was characterized by general instability, disorganization and lack of cohesion among the tribes: "*In those days there was no king in Israel; everyman did what was right on his eyes*" [Shoftim (Judges) XXI: 25]. The Judges were not judges in the legal sense (except for Deborah), but charismatic leaders, emerging in severe crises and impelled to action by divine inspiration. There were twelve judges: six major ones (Othniel, Ehud, Deborah, Gideon/with his son Abimelech?, Jephthah and Samson) and six minor ones (Shamgar, Tola, Jair, Ibzan, Elon and Abdon) (Werblowsky ve Wigoder 1997: 384-385; Hirsch ve Ryssel 1901: 381-384). The three of the great Judges (Otheniel, Deborah and Gideon) reigned for 40 years. Ehud's ruling time, the second of the great Judges, was 80 years. All the rest judged under 40 years (between 3 to 23 years). Thus, Ehud's 80 years period prevents us from presenting an inference on "40 years limited power of Qagans" over the Judges's ruling times. we think that this limited 40 years ruling process of the Khazar Qagan was likely to symbolize "a generation" as mentioned above.

Furthermore, we need to mention one more point about the issue of "Judges". When I decided to start this study in line with the clues that caught my attention, I was not aware of until then, but had the opportunity to review during this research. Based on the texts of the Genizah Letter/Schechter Letter (Zuckerman 1995: 251; Karatay 2008: 9)[1], V. Petrukhin suggested that the Qaganal office after the Khazar's adoption of Judaism, could be related to the "Judges' model" of pre-monarchic Israel (Petrukhin 2013: 292-293). And in his perivous article (2004), he particularly emphasizes to the end of the Judges period – the prophet Samuel's anointed Saul as the king who became the first monarch of the kingdom of Israel (Petrukhin 2004: 274-275). We can't reject this views, however as mentioned above; according to the TaNaKh, the most striking feature of this period was a general instability and disorganization among the Israelite tribes as well as the absence of the certain kings. Although the *Îšâ/Beg* was appeared to be the "de facto" rulers of the Qaganate, the Khazars had always

[1] The Letter briefly states that after the conversion; Jews from Byzantium, Khorasan and Baghdat went to Khazaria and strenghten the Jewish faith. Then, they appointed one of the wise men as "Judge" and called him in Khazarian language as Qagan/Xaqan. They also changed the name of the chief-officer to *Sabriel* and made him king – his real name was not mentioned in the Letter.

a "certain-unique" Qagan who was a sacred image among his people. But in the context of diarchy, the prophet Samuel and king Saul dichotomy seems to be a remarkable model to consider for the correlation with the Khazarian "royal diarchy/dual kingship" or "sacred diarchy".

1.3. Keeping Distance From The Qagan

As we mentioned above Ibn Fadlan wrote that 1) "Qagan does not show himself except once in every four months, but appearing at a great distance" 2) "when he rides on horseback in public, the whole army marches out to escort him, but a mile was left between him and the cavalary".

The most researchers have been explained this situtaion as originating from the old Turkic belief of Heavenly Qagan (having *qut/kut* given by Tengri; the Heavenly mandate to rule). On the other hand the same observation can be attributed to TaNaKh as well;

> **Shemot (Exodus)** [20: 18]: "So the people remained at a distance, while Moses approached to the thick cloud where God was"; **Shemot (Exodus)** [24: 1-2]: "Then He (the Lord) said to Moses, 'Come up to the Lord, with Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy elders of Israel, and bow low from afar (you are to worship at a distance). Moses alone shall come near the Lord; but the others shall not come near, nor shall the people come up with him'"; **Shemot (Exodus)** [34: 30]: "Aaron and all the Israelites saw that the skin of Moses' face was radiant; and they shrank from coming near him". (JPS Tanakh 2003: 156, 164, 190)

We can explain that "keeping distance from the Qagan" originates from the relevant passages in TaNaKh. – as a result of communication between God and Moses. In fact, for the Khazar royal community, who were seemed as strongly devoteed to their new Judaic belief, to take this ritual from TaNakh would be more reasonable. It would have been easy to accept this relevant passages in TaNaKh due to its' similarity to the old Heavenly Qagan belief – or may be more "enhanced-sanctified" ruler model that emerges from the amalgam of the old and new beliefs.

2. The Reference in Ibn Rustah's Account

Now, we will consider on the record of Ibn Rustah (*Kitâbü'l-A`lâki'n-Nefîse*) whose information about the Khazars provides us the title of *Îšâ/Îshâ/Isha*.

> Ibn Rustah wrote that: "Their king (*melik*) is called *Îšâ/Isha* [ايشا]. Their supreme lord is Khazar *Xâqân*. But the latter is lord in name only, the real power belongs to the *Îšâ* as he, concerning the affairs of government and the command of the army, occupies such a position that he does not have to account to anyone who would be greater than himself. Their supreme ruler is an adherent of Jewish faith, and likewise the *Īšā*, the warlords and nobles who are with him. The rest of the Khazars profess a religion

similar to that of the Turks..." (Dunlop 1954: 104-105; Golden 1980: 97-98; Golden 2007b: 163-164; Şeşen 2001: 36; Yörükan 2004: 292).

Ibn Rustah's record contains three important datas: 1) the *melik* (king) was called *Îšâ* 2) the supreme lord i.e. the Khazar Qagan, the *Îšâ* (*melik*), war-lords and nobles were professing the Jewish faith 3) The real power belonged to *Îšâ*.

2.1. The title of *Îšâ (Isha/İşa)*

Both Ibn Rustah and Ibn Faḍlân stated that *Îšâ* (or Beg/Beh) commands the armies and governs the state affairs, and also makes public appearances.

Îšâ/Îshâ, the title of the ruler – *Melik* (i.e King) or viceroy (al-Wakil/Naip) – in Ibn Rustah's record appeared as *Beg/Beh* (ibn Faḍlân. *Xâqân Beh*; al-Istaxrî and ibn Havkal *beg~bek*, **yilig*) and then **Abşad – Îšâd* and *Îrân šâh* in later Islamic written sources. This complicated situation or the alternation on the title may be explained due to the difference in discourse between the Turks and the Jews on Court. That is to say the Jews in bureocracy were probably used the title as *Îšâ*, and the Turks (Judaized or not) called as Beg/Beh. The Persian historian Gardizi's *Zeynü'l-aḫbâr* (1050's) which was thought to be a copy of Ibn Rustah's *Kitâbü'l-A`lâki'n-Nefîse's* "Khazar section"; this title shown as **Abşad/Ebşad*? and **İşad/Îšâd* (Oxford - Cambridge versions). And al-Bekri (1094's) had written it as *"Îrân šâh"*. The commonly accepted view about the *Îšâ* and **Îšâd* forms was that these were the corruptions of an ancient Turkic title *Şad/Šad* [senior or crown prince] which thought to be a variant of an old Persian prince title *Xšyd*, *Ixshêd* (Golden 1980: 99, 208; Golden 2007b: 165-166). *Xšyd/Ixshêd/Îxšid/İhşid* was an old title used by Sogdian and Ferghana rulers – in Arabic '*melikü'l-mülûk*' was its equivalent (Ağırakça 2000: 550-551). In contrast, here it seems like that the corrupted and converted name was probably the *Îšâ*. Due to his ancestral origins the Persian author Gardizi might have tried to relate this name into this old Sogdian-Fergana title: *İhşid/ Îxšid/ Xšyd/Ixshêd.*

Now, we are hypothesizing that *Îšâ* was a specific official title chosen by religiously motivated reasons which might be referred to prophet *Isaiah* [*Yəša'yāhū* (Isaiah/İşaya)="YHWH (Yahwe) is salvation" (Madeleine S. Miller ve J. Lane Miller 1973: 284-285)[2]]. According to the Rabbis, Isaiah is the most forbearing, as well as the most ardent patriot, among the prophets; who was always protecting the Kingdom of Israel and saking for forgiveness of its sins. He

[2] Isaiah was the VIII. century B.C. Hebrew prophet. The book of Isaiah was the largest book of the major prophets, so its at the head of the prophetic books in the TaNaKh. It contains three different historical periods, therefore it can be divided into three main sections: 1) chaps. 1-39, First Isaiah in 8th century B.C. (738-687 B.C.); 2) chaps. 40-55, the second or Deutero-Isaiah – after 580 B.C. during the Exile; 3) chaps. 56-66, the Third or Trito Isaiah, prior to the arrival of Nehemiah in Jerusalem in 444 B.C. Here, we are reffering to the first Isaiah.

was therefore distinguished from all other prophets in that he received revelations directly from God not through an intermediary. In the order of greatness Isaiah is placed immediately after Moses by the Rabbis; even in some respects Isaiah surpasses Moses, for he reduced the commandments to six: "*honesty in dealing; sincerity in speech; refusal of illicit gain; absence of corruption; aversion for bloody deeds; contempt for evil*". Then, he reduced the six to two — *justice* and *charity*. The chief merit of Isaiah's prophecies is their consoling character, for while Moses said, "*Thou shalt perish in the midst of the nation*", Isaiah announced *deliverance* (The Jewish Encyclopedia 1901: 635-636; The New Bible Dictionary 1962: 574; Noegel ve Wheeler 2010: 153-154).

Thus, the name of the prophet Isaiah (*Îšâya*/İşaya) might be turned into a religio-symbollic title as *Îšâ – this could be also a misspelling form of Îšâya* – that represents "deliverance - protection and 'the hope'" of Jewish people to attain a new state (Khazar Qaganate) after the Roman apocalypse.

3. Conclusion

Finally, we hypothesize that the Sacred Diarchy (dual kingship/royal diarchy or sacral kingship) system in Khazar Qaganate – which had not an example in traditional Turkic steppe state formations – might have been taken from the Moše/Moses (Holy King-"man of God") and Aharon/Aaron (*Kohen Gadol*/High Priest) co-ruling model in TaNaKh (Jacobs vd. 1901: 44-57). During the seven days of dedication or the forty years of wandering in the desert, Moses was officiated as high priest and also king through this entire period. When he asked for these two offices to his descendants, God (*YHWH*/*Yahweh*) told him that the office of "King" was destined for David and his house, while the office of "High Priest" was reserved for Aaron and his offspring. As we understand in several passages in TaNaKh (TaNaKh's portion of Torah), officially Moses was the highest authority however, Aaron shared this authority not only as a deputy and High Priest but also as "talking Moses's words". Aaron was almost always in public, spent time with the people of Israelites involving himself with their daily life, while Moses (man of God-the father-the head-the master) was a "distant-remote" figure who spends time talking with God – in addition God (*YHWH*) helped both Moses and Aaron. The role played by Aaron in the events that preceded in TaNaKh [Torah] was ministerial and his function included the duties of spokesman and implied personal dealings with the court on behalf of Moses (McCurdy ve Kohler 1901: 2-5). And *Îšâ* might be a symbolic Jewish title, as it related to the prophet Isaiah, who is considered to be the protector of the Jewish people and Israelite Kingdom by the Rabbis. At first glance, all this may not seem to be of great importance or sounds like strained interpretations; however, when you examine that of TaNaKh-based official state ceremonies and administrative metaphors in the ruling system of the Qaganate, it will be evident. Inheriting some symbolic essences from ancient Altaic-Turkic origin steppe state motifs, basically the Khazar Qaganate's religious adherence to Judaic

Avrasyad e-ISSN: 2147-2610

concepts is a strong indicator that the "Sacred Diarchy" was probably formed by *Halakha* (Jewish Religious Law).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ağırakça. Ahmet. 2000. "İhşîd". ss. 550-551 içinde *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi (DİA).* C. 21. Ankara: TDV Yayınları.

Dunlop, D. M. 1954. *The Jewish Khazars*, New jersey: Princeton University Press.

Easton, M. G. 1897. "barefoot", *Eastons Bible Dictionary*, 3th. ed. (1897): 138. Accessed February 22, 2022. Easton's Bible Dictionary (archive.org); https://ccel.org/e/easton/ebd/ebd3.html.

_____ "Fire", *Eastons Bible Dictionary*, 3th. ed. (1897): 435-436. Accessed February 22, 2022. Easton's Bible Dictionary (archive.org); https://ccel.org/e/easton/ebd/ebd3.html .

Frazer, J. G. 1917. "The Killing of The Khazar Kings". *Folklore*. 28 (4): 382-407.

Golden, Peter B. 2007a. "The conversion of khazars to Judaism" içinde *The World of the Khazars*, ed. P. Golden, H. Ben-Shammai, András Roná-Tas, HdO studies. 8 (17): 123-162.

_____ 2007b. "Irano-Turcica: The Khazar Sacral Kingship Revisited" *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung.*, 60 (2): 161-194.

_____ 1980. *Khazar Studies*. C. 1. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Ha-Yashar, Sefer (Midrash). 1876. (Çev. Edward B.M. Browne). New York: accessed July 20, 2022.https://www.sefaria.org/Sefer_HaYashar_(midrash)%2C_Book_of_Exodus.31?lang=bi

Hirsch, Emil G. ve Ryssel, Victor. 1901. "Judges, Period of". ss. 381-384 içinde *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. C. 7. New York–London: Funk&Wagnalls.

Jacobs, Joseph vd. 1901. "Moses". ss. 44-57 içinde *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. C. 9. New York–London: Funk&Wagnalls.

JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh (The Traditional Hebrew Text And The New JPS Translation). 2003. (2. baskı). Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Karatay, Osman. 2008. "Hazarların Musevileşmesine Dair Bir Belge: Kenize Mektubu". Karadeniz Araştırmaları. 18: 1-17.

Mccurdy, J. Frederic ve Kohler, Kaufmann. 1901. "Aaron". ss. 2-5 içinde *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, C. 1.New York–London: Funk&Wagnalls.

Miller, Madeleine S. ve Miller. J. Lane. 1973. "Isaiah". ss. 284-287 içinde *Harper's Bible Dictionary*, 8.th ed. New York: Harper&Row Publishers.

Müslüman Coğrafyacıların Gözüyle Ortaçağ'da Türkler. 2004. (der. ve çev. Yusuf Ziya Yörükan). İstanbul: Gelenek Yayınları.

Avrasyad e-ISSN: 2147-2610

Noegel, Scott B. ve Wheeler, Brannon M. 2010. *The A to Z of Prophets in Islam and Judaism*. UK: The Scarecrow Press.

Petrukhin, Vladimir. 2013. "Sacral Kingship and the Judaism of the Khazars". ss. 291-301 içinde *Conversions: Looking for Ideological Change in the Early Middle Ages/Studia Medievalia Septentrionalia*. Bd. 23. Ed. Leszek Slupecki ve Rudolf Simek. Vienna: Fassbaender.

_____ 2004. "A Note on the sacral status of the Khazarian Khagan: Tradition and reality". ss. 269-275 içinde *Monotheistic Kingship (The Medieval Variants)*. Ed. Aziz Al-Azmeh ve Janos M. Bak. Budapest: Central European University Press.

Pritsak, Omeljan. 1978. "The Khazar Kingdom's Conversion to Judaism", *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 2 (3): 261-281.

Schechter, Solomon ve Hirsch, Emil G. 1901. "Fire". ss. 391-393 içinde *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, c. 5. New York–London: Funk&Wagnalls.

Smith, James E. 2001. *Isaiah:A Christian Interpretation*. Lulu Enterprises Incorporated.

Şeşen, Ramazan. 2001. *İslam Coğrafyacılarına Göre Türkler ve Türk Ülkeleri*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

_____2010. *İbn Faḍlân Seyahatnamesi (Ve Ekleri)*. İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınları.

The Holy Bible (Old and New Testaments). 1952. RSV (Revised Standart Version), US: Thomas Nelson And Sons Ltd.

The Holy Qur-Ān (English translation of the meanings and Commentary). AH. 1411. Revised&Edited by The Presidency of Islamic Researches, IFTA, Call and Guidance, Al-Madinah Al-Munawarah: King Fahd Holy Qur-ān Printing Complex.

The New Bible Dictionary. 1962. "Fire". ss. 422-423. (ed. J. D. Douglas). Leicester: InterVarsity Press.

_____ "Isaiah, Book of". ss. 570-578 (ed. J. D. Douglas). Leicester: InterVarsity Press.

The Oxford Dictionary of Jewish Religion. 1997. "Burning Bush". ss. 143. (ed. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky, Geoffrey Wigoder). Oxford University Press.

_____ "Judges, Book of". ss. 384-385. (ed. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky ve Geoffrey Wigoder). Oxford University Press.

Zuckerman, Constantin. 1995. "On the Date of the Khazars Conversion to Judaism and the Chronology of the Kings of the Rus Oleg and Igor. A Study of the Anonymous Khazar Letter from the Genizah of Cairo", *Revue des études byzanties*, 53: 237-270.

https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Acts+13&version=NIV [Holy Bible, New International Version® NIV® Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984, 2011 by Biblica, Inc.® Accessed 2 Şubat 2022)].

https://www.chabad.org/library/bible_cdo/aid/9864/jewish/Chapter-3.htm (© copyright The Judaica Press) Accessed 17 Aralık 2021.

Avrasyad e-ISSN: 2147-2610